

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants request reconsideration of this application in view of the present Amendment.

By this Amendment claims 1, 3-5 and 7-15 are cancelled. New claims 16-25 are added.

**New Claim 16**

Original claim 7 is rewritten as new claim 16. Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 16 is in condition for allowance and allowance is requested.

**New Claims 17-25**

***35 U.S.C §§ 102/103***

New claim 17 is submitted to distinguish the invention from the prior art. Specifically, new claim 17 recites a support material for the catalyst library that has an infrared-reflectivity close to, at or below the infrared-reflectivity of slate. Willson (U.S. Patent No. 6,063,633) does not teach or suggest a library support material with an infrared-reflectivity close to, at or below the infrared-reflectivity of slate. Willson is completely silent as to any kind of infrared-reflectivity and as to any specifics of a possible support material for catalysts in view of the object to reduce infrared background noise.

Specifically, as has been pointed out by the Examiner, Willson teaches the use of infrared thermography, thermographic techniques and/or infrared cameras to monitor the temperature of a number of catalyst sites simultaneously. *See* Column 3, lines 4 et seq. Willson further teaches that the temperature in each cell may be judged by "normalizing the observed IR energy emission by the emissivity calculated from the images taken under nonreactive conditions." Column 7, lines 29-31. However, Willson is completely silent as to the thermal requirements pertaining to the catalyst support and/or the catalyst's environment in order to achieve ideal conditions for recording the infrared differences images, in particular for reactions having small changes in temperature. Therefore, Willson does not teach or suggest the specific infrared-reflectivity as claimed.

New claim 17 thus recites elements that are neither taught nor suggested by Willson and is, therefore, not anticipated by Willson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). New claims 18-25 recite

additional limitations that further distinguish the claims over the prior art and are, thus, also not anticipated by Willson under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Similarly, because new claim 17 recites elements that are neither taught nor suggested by Willson, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be established for new claim 17 in view of Willson. Thus, new claim 17 is not made obvious by Willson under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

New claims 18-25 depend from new claim 17 and recite additional limitations that further distinguish the claims over the prior art. Thus, new claims 18-25 are also not made obvious by Willson under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2**


The language that formed the basis for the § 112 rejection does not appear in new claim 17. Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 17 complies with § 112.

New claims 18-25 depend from new claim 17 and similarly do not contain the language that formed the basis of the § 112 rejection. Thus, new claims 18-25 also comply with § 112.

**Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael R. Asam                      Reg. No. 51,417  
Jones Day  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-7770